

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his continued examination of the present application, and for interviewing the case with Applicants' representative. By way of summary, Claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, and 11-43 are currently pending in the present application. All of the pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, any characterizations made of the present application or of the prior art, and any official notice taken explicitly or implicitly by the Office Action.

A. Rejection of Claims 1, 7, 9-10, 12-13, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 7, 9-10, 12-13, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,174 to Doidge et al. ("Doidge") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,327 to Zhang et al. ("Zhang"). Applicants respectfully submit that Doidge and Zhang, taken alone or in combination with each other or other references of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of these claims.

With regard to **Claim 1**, the cited references do not teach or render obvious at least the step of "accessing a user profile . . . the user profile stored in a user profile database, where the user profile is accessed based upon the attribute associated with the portable communication device." The Office Action relies upon Zhang for this limitation ("Doidge is silent on accessing a user profile . . ." Office Action at 3).

However, Zhang also fails to provide this limitation. Zhang discloses that "the subscriber will be prompted by the dialer application to enter appropriate identification and authentication information, usually in the form of a user-name and private password." Col. 6 Ln. 29-33. Additionally, "[a]t reference number 150, the gateway device receives the LCP packets containing the authorization and authentication information from the host computer. The gateway device, at reference number 160, generates and forwards to an authentication server a RADIUS account logon request packet. At reference number 170, the authentication server matches the access request packet against unique user profiles to verify the authenticity of the subscriber." Col. 7 Ln. 8-15. Zhang's "user profile" is therefore related to the identification and authentication information – "in the form of a user-name and private password." Zhang does not disclose where "the user profile is accessed **based upon the attribute associated with the**

portable communication device” “wherein the attribute comprises an indication of a location comprises a port, circuit ID, VLAN ID or MAC address from which the request was received.”

Because no prior art discloses accessing a user profile based upon the attribute associated with the portable communication device, Claim 1 would not have been an obvious combination of Zhang and Doidge.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that a combination of Doidge and Zhang teach the limitations of Claim 1, such a combination would render Doidge unsuitable for its intended purpose. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143.01, part V: “If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).” *See also* M.P.E.P. § 2141.02, part VI: A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).

As Applicants’ representative explained during the interview, Doidge places significant emphasis on expediency and efficiency. Indeed, efficiency is of such concern in Doidge that the disclosed embodiments forego a general-purpose microprocessor in favor of specialized computing hardware suited to its particular tasks. As Applicants’ representative explained, the addition of additional features, such as those taught in Zhang, would thus impose efficiency penalties that would render Doidge unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Applicants wish to draw the Examiner’s attention to at least the following passages of Doidge, with emphasis added:

“The hardware forwarding engine converts layer 2 protocols between the dissimilar ports **expediently**, without requiring intervention by a microprocessor. A substantial gain is attained compared to microprocessor controlled format converters.” Abstract.

“The disclosed system relates to bridging between networks using special-purpose hardware.” Col. 1 Ln. 12-14.

[Distinguishing the prior art:] “The present invention maps switch header to ATM control header but uses hard-ware rather than a processor to do the

mapping function. Ishii's solution is related to slower network transfer rates where slower microprocessor controlled mapping is permissible. The present invention is for **higher speed networks where Ischii's processing mapping speeds are not acceptable.**" Col. 2 Ln. 40-47.

[Distinguishing the prior art:] "However, the present invention maps switch header to ATM control header but uses hardware rather than a processor to do the mapping function. Horney's solution is related to slower network transfer rates (56 Kbits/sec) where slower microprocessor mapping is permissible. The present invention is for higher speed (155 Mbits/sec) networks where **processing mapping speeds are not acceptable.**" Col.2 Ln. 67-Col. 3 Ln. 6.

[Distinguishing another prior art reference:] "Won uses memory and a microprocessor in the conversion system . . . The present invention neither . . . nor uses microprocessor control in bridging . . ." Col. 3 Ln. 15-20.

[Distinguishing another prior art reference:] "Gaddis uses software control by a processor, and **the present invention is more efficient using an all hardware solution.**" Col. 4 Ln. 30-33.

[Distinguishing another prior art reference:] "The present invention is better, because **general purpose processors cannot handle a specific task as quickly** as special hardware can." Col. 4 Ln. 60-62.

"It is an object of this invention to sort incoming LAN messages at each ATM port of the switch into two different paths **for efficient routing or bridging** between dissimilar networks." Col. 5 Ln 38-41.

"It is a further object of this invention to provide **a high performance** bridging path between two dissimilar networks by implementing the bridging path as a hardware forwarding engine . . ." Col. 5 Ln. 42-46.

"The present invention adds ATM ports and **an efficient hardware format** conversion and forwarding engine . . ." Col. 8 Ln. 11-13.

"Thus, the present invention permits local area networks to expand their range to include interconnection to any LAN connected to ATM network 25 and **to transfer data at the highest possible rate.**" Col. 8 Ln. 41-44.

“The present invention is for special-purpose hardware . . . **for expediently handling format conversion** and frame forwarding. . .” Col. 8 Ln. 57-59.

“Bridged frames require only layer 2 data link protocol conversion, and special-purpose hardware means are implemented in the switch-to-header conversion block 85 to **convert bridged frames quickly and efficiently without requiring processor intervention.**” Col. 10 Ln. 62-65.

As the foregoing makes clear, the Doidge reference contemplates speed and efficiency in its design, in particular emphasizing the advantages of specialized hardware over a general purpose processor. In view of this purpose, a skilled artisan would not have combined Doidge with a system which requires “accessing a user profile . . . the user profile stored in a user profile database” of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

The Office Action rejected **Claims 9 and 18** with identical reasoning as claim 1. For at least the reasons submitted above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants also submit that Claims 9 and 18 are not rendered obvious by Doidge and Zhang.

Claims 7, 10, and 12-13, which depend from either Claim 1 or Claim 8, are believed to be patentable for the reasons articulated above with respect to their respective independent claim, and because of the additional features recited therein.

B. Rejection of Claims 3-4, 6, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 3-4, 6, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,174 to Doidge et al. (“Doidge”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,327 to Zhang et al. (“Zhang”) and U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,619 to Lim et al. (“Lim”). Applicants respectfully submit that Doidge, Zhang, and Lim, taken alone or in combination with each other or other references of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of these claims.

Claims 3-4, 6, 8, and 15, which depend from either Claim 1 or Claim 9, are believed to be patentable for the reasons articulated above with respect to their respective independent claims, and because of the additional features recited therein.

C. Rejection of Claims 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,174 to Doidge et al. ("Doidge") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,327 to Zhang et al. ("Zhang") and U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,619 to Lim et al. ("Lim"). Applicants respectfully submit that Doidge, Zhang, and Lim, taken alone or in combination with each other or other references of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of these claims.

Claims 25-36, which depend from either Claim 1, Claim 9, or Claim 18, are believed to be patentable for the reasons articulated above with respect to their respective independent claims, and because of the additional features recited therein.

D. Rejection of Claims 37-40 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 37-40 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,174 to Doidge et al. ("Doidge") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. ("Levergood"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, any characterizations made of the present application or of the prior art, and any official notice taken explicitly or implicitly by the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that Doidge and Levergood, taken alone or in combination with each other or other references of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of these claims.

With regard to **Claim 37**, the cited prior art fails to teach or render obvious all the limitations of the claim. First, for at least the reasons articulated with regard to Claim 1 above, a combination of Doidge and Levergood would render Doidge unsuitable for its intended purpose. As described above, Doidge emphasizes efficiency and processing speed, highlighting the advantages of a specialized circuitry over a general purpose processor. Like the combination of Doidge and Zhang, above, a combination of Doidge and Levergood would frustrate the purposes of Doidge, and a skilled artisan would not have sought to combine Doidge with Levergood. Such a combination would have frustrated Doidge's intent of providing speed and efficiency because redirection to another URL for providing authentication in an inherently slower activity than specialized circuitry.

Second, Doidge and Levergood, alone or in combination with other references of record, fail to teach or suggest at least "communicating [a] modified request to a redirection server," "responding, at the redirection server, to the modified request with a browser redirect message

that reassigns the modified request to an administrator-specified, redirected destination address,” “receiving, at the gateway device, the browser redirect message and modifying it with the stored original destination address,” and “sending the modified browser redirect message to the computer, which automatically redirects the computer to the redirected destination address.” Levergood only teaches that “[t]he content server may redirect the client to an authentication server,” using a redirect URL, “[t]hat URL requests authentication and specifies the domain and the initial URL. In response to the redirect, the client browser automatically sends a GET request with the provided URL. See Levergood, Col. 6 Ln. 28-34 & Fig. 3. The Office Action further agrees that Doidge fails to teach or suggest these limitations. *See* Office Action at 8-9.

For the foregoing reasons, the cited prior art fails to teach or render obvious the elements of Claim 37. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

The Office Action rejected **Claim 40** with identical reasoning as claim 37. For at least the reasons submitted above with respect to Claim 37, Applicants also submit that Claim 40 is not rendered obvious by Doidge and Levergood.

Claims 38-39 and 43, which depend from either Claim 37 or Claim 40, are believed to be patentable for the reasons articulated above with respect to their respective independent claim, and because of the additional features recited therein.

E. Rejection of Claims 41-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 41-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,174 to Doidge et al. (“Doidge”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,327 to Zhang et al. (“Zhang”) and U.S. Pat. No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. (“Levergood”). Applicants respectfully submit that Doidge, Zhang, and Levergood, taken alone or in combination with each other or other references of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of these claims.

Claims 41 and 42, which depend from Claim 40, are believed to be patentable for the reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 40, and because of the additional features recited therein.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this

Application No.: 09/458,602
Filing Date: December 8, 1999

application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 25, 2010

By: 

Charles Duan
Registration No. 65,114
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(949) 760-0404

AMEND

9242293
062210